

before doing so she obtained the right to enter the Pyrenees Mountains and abstract therefrom iron and copper ores. So she undertook, the moment she made a loan, to begin to "draw down"; and "draw down" she did. She sent a mission to Russia having in view possibly a loan to Russia, and only last Thursday a new trade agreement with Russia was announced by Great Britain.

Yet it is proposed that we consider even the possibility of going into this war by furnishing munitions, arms, and implements of war without even taking the elementary precaution to make sure that if Great Britain should lose the war we would not be drawn into a defensive war of our own.

The very least we could do, it seems to me, would be to take those first important steps for our own protection.

Mr. President, there is only one other point I wish to develop. In March of the present year testimony was read into the Record from General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, who told us that there were 879 combat planes in the hands of the United States Army. We had under discussion at the time the President's recommendation of an appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the creation of a 6,000-war-plane force. It was contemplated that we could build up to 3,000 planes by 1941. We had at the time 879.

If there be any possibility of an attack upon our shores—and I personally think it is grotesque and fantastic even to imagine such a thing—if there be any such possibility, we are the ones who need the munitions, and we are the ones who need the planes. I submit that a strong America will be an efficient bulwark against any attack on our shores.

I agree with Colonel Lindbergh that the repeal of the arms embargo is a step toward war. I believe that next would come the extension of credits, next would come the sending of men, completing our actual involvement in the war itself.

Mr. President, I believe the pending joint resolution is defective in the particulars which I have taken pains to illustrate, and I hope, and I want the Record to show that I hope, that it will be defeated.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, let Thy holy silence sink deep into our hearts that the truth we know may be the candle of the Lord. Hush all our complainings and discontent and give the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Let us rejoice and be glad that we have a part in the world's great work. Renew the life of Thy church everywhere, quicken its devotion and passion for the souls of men. Take the beam out of our own eye that we may see clearly to cast the mote out of our brother's eye. Restrain the wayward, relieve the oppressed, the poor, and be the toilers' friend. May pride, oppression, and all godless ambitions be remembered only as the things of the night. Let all who love the Lord Jesus stand for those virtues which build up the human heart in truth, honor, fidelity, love, and obedience to God. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two letters, one signed by Francis B. Denton and the other by Gordon Auchincloss in answer to a letter placed in the daily Record a few days ago purporting to be

signed by Col. E. M. House. In this connection I also ask unanimous consent to include an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times of date October 14, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address made by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it exceeds the amount permitted ordinarily. I therefore renew my request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therewith a very splendid address on the need for an increased air force in this country delivered by Mr. Horner, the President of the National Aeronautics Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address I delivered last night at Station WOL, Washington, over a national network, on the subject, Our National Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therewith an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of this date.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein quotations from a speech made by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes after the conclusion of the other special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

#### NEUTRALITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the remarks I have prepared on the subject of neutrality, I wish to refer briefly to three subjects that have already been discussed here in the House.

I followed with a great deal of interest the questions asked by our colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] regarding a letter inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]. Twenty-one years ago Colonel House befriended me when I was 3,000 miles from home. I have always had a very warm spot in my heart for Col. E. M. House. For that reason, if for no other, let me state that I have read what purports to be a letter written by Colonel House inserted in the daily Record by the gentleman from Montana, and I want to state for the Record that I sincerely doubt its authenticity and feel very sure that the letter could not have been written and was not written by Colonel House. At this time when we are starting debate on a bill that is going to have a great effect on the future peace of this country, it seems to me to be ill-advised to insert in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything that would stir up racial or religious hatred. I express the hope that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKEKELSON], in view of all the circumstances and in view of the fact that he has stated on the floor that he does not know positively that the letter is authentic, that of his own volition he will withdraw that letter and keep it out of the permanent RECORD of the House.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I hope he and every Member of the House will read certain letters I will insert in the RECORD today under permission granted me a few minutes ago, one of them being from the secretary to the late E. M. House, who served him, I believe, some 40 years, and the other from his son-in-law, stating in very positive terms that that letter is a spurious document. So I join with the gentleman in the request that he makes and the hope he expresses, because it does seem to me that of all documents in this day and time that should reflect the absolute truth it is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure every Member of the House at all times, when he knows the facts, wants to preserve that as an honest, truthful record. I hope my friend will read these letters I am putting in the RECORD today which condemn that as a spurious document.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. When I put the letter in I did not say it was Colonel House. I made no claim to that effect. Another thing, I said to disregard the signer at the end of the letter, and in my remarks, if you will turn to the RECORD, I made that statement. I said to only read the substance matter of the letter and then compare that with conditions that have happened in the past 20 years. I have looked it up. It is stated in the letter that General Rodman was knighted by the British Government and the record is over here in the Congressional Library.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot yield any further unless the gentleman wants to withdraw the letter.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I just wanted to clear that up.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman stated on the floor of the House that the letter was signed by E. M. House, and in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], he stated it was the Colonel House who was associated with President Wilson. His answer may be found on page 391 of the RECORD. I hope it will not be necessary to object to future unanimous-consent requests, which may be made by Mr. THORKEKELSON, which many of us feel constrained to do, unless the letter is withdrawn.

I had not intended to refer to the matter brought before the House a few days ago and referred to again yesterday, the formation of a committee known as the National Committee To Keep America Out of War, but apparently that is going to be brought up from time to time and I take this opportunity to say that I for one can see no objection to any group, even if they are Members of the House, forming themselves together as a committee for this purpose. I was invited to attend the meeting and I did attend the meeting at which time this committee was formed. I want the RECORD to show I am proud to belong to such a committee. The thought has been expressed that those who join such a committee imply that those who are not members of the committee want to lead the country into war. If some of us want to form an organization to perpetuate wildlife, that does not mean that all those who do not join that organization are in favor of the elimination of wildlife. In the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee yesterday he referred to that same matter. It seems to me it is the old story of those who are on one side insisting they are simply sending out facts, while the other side is issuing propaganda. It is the old saying, "My organization and the other fellow's gang."

I checked up on this matter and find that the stationery used by that committee has been paid for either by the committee or through contributions received by the committee. No material has gone out under the name of that committee

under anyone's frank. The postage has been paid on all mail put out relating to the work of the committee. I heard an offer made to the committee by a man who on his past record could have made good who offered to go out and raise \$100,000 for the purposes of the work of that committee, which offer was declined because there was no need of any such huge sum. There are a great many people, however, who feel they want to contribute to such a cause.

Mr. KITCHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. KITCHENS. I do not doubt the sincerity and desire of the gentleman who is speaking, but this particular organization has sent out, as I understand it, letters seeking contributions to enable it to carry on certain propaganda.

Mr. MILLER. To put out facts, if I may correct the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHENS. Are those contributions to be limited to people in this country and not to be accepted from people like this bund outfit up here? It is stated that this country is being flooded with propaganda by agents of Russia, Germany, and other countries. Will that committee accept funds from those agents?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will read the names on that letterhead, I think he will feel perfectly confident they will have nothing to do with any German bund or any subversive organization.

Mr. KITCHENS. How can they tell?

Mr. MILLER. The committee will check the source of all donations.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That committee will not try to sell the economic royalists our President's autographed books for \$250 each, through the Postmaster General, and shake down millions of dollars of campaign funds for New Deal political propaganda purposes, which include distributing portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by majority employees under the dome of the Capitol at an expense of many thousands of dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman himself, or any Member on the floor now, know of any Congressman, whether or not he solicits a contribution, who would refuse one to his campaign fund so that he might be reelected, or who would refuse to send out from his own office in the House Office Building his own campaign material? Tell me the difference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman from Michigan has put his finger on the point. There is not any difference. It is a political campaign and that is what I objected to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia permit his secretary to send out letters written on the Congressman's time to his own personal friends? What is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Asking for funds to influence legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He uses Government time and Government stationery to answer his own personal correspondence.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman kicks on sending out letters asking for contributions to send out arguments designed to keep us out of war?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I kick on taking up a collection for a committee under the dome of the Capitol to influence legislation pending before the Congress. It has never been done before in the history of the Government and it ought never to be done again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. From the Postmaster General, who is also chairman of the National Democratic Committee, right on down the line—from the Government offices on Government time this administration solicits contributions for political purposes, and to aid in getting those contributions official pressure is applied. Does not the gentleman aid his



campaign by accepting contributions for his own election to further his own views and the views of his party?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely; and what is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman admit that this is a political campaign? That is what I think it is.

Mr. MILLER. Now that we have disposed of that subject for the time being, at least, I should like to express the hope that when the neutrality bill, House Joint Resolution 306, finally reaches us in the House, we can have adequate time to consider and debate the bill properly. I certainly express the hope that when the bill reaches here partisanship will be completely eliminated. I would like nothing better than to see a row of chairs put right in this center aisle so that we can eliminate any division between the two parties. I would like to see the minority and the majority leaders exchange seats during this debate simply as a symbol that there is to be no partisanship.

I do not believe anyone on my right need feel any obligation or responsibility or loyalty to the President because he proposed certain provisions of the bill, and certainly no Member on my left should feel called upon to oppose any provision of the bill because it was proposed by the President, who is leader of the opposition party.

I asked for this time this morning, Mr. Speaker, not because I thought I had any great words of wisdom to impart but because I hoped to be able to make a few thought-provoking suggestions, and possibly raise a few questions in the minds of those who are in favor of repealing the arms embargo.

My good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], a few days ago, referred to the mail that he had received on this subject and mentioned that a good deal of it was undoubtedly put out by some organization that wanted to influence the outcome. I, too, have received an unusually heavy mail; at least, I am told by men who have been here a great many years that it is a heavy mail on any subject. Up until a few days ago; that is, from the opening of this special session until last Thursday, I have received from my district 3,212 letters or postal cards—that is, individual communications, and not including petitions—and only 373 of those were in favor of repealing the arms embargo.

I believe I should point out that I represent a district that has, within its limits, several munitions factories, and one of the largest manufacturers of aircraft engines and propellers. Among that mail were letters from men who are employed by a munitions factory, and by an aircraft factory, and these men said that while, undoubtedly, the repeal of the arms embargo would aid them in that they would get more money and would get overtime, they did not feel that the gamble was worth while, and they therefore urged that the embargo be continued.

Reference has been made to organized minorities sending these communications to Congressmen. I believe we can admit that that is just about 50-50—both sides are guilty. Out of the 373 communications I have received in favor of repeal, 126 were in the form of the postal card I hold in my hand, with my name and address printed on one side and the message printed on the other, leaving simply a space for the signature of the constituent. The message is this:

It is your duty to uphold the President of the United States. Vote for the repeal of the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act.

Certainly any constituent has the right to sign this card, but undoubtedly it would be classified as organized propaganda inasmuch as it was printed by some individual or organization. Further, I do not believe the question before this House is whether or not we are to uphold the President of the United States. This is something that each Member of the House and the other body must decide in answer to his own conscience, and to his own constituents. It is not a case of upholding or defeating the President of the United States.

I should judge from a good deal of the mail I have received that many who have written to me are hysterical. One might think that we were considering a declaration of war, rather

than the enactment of neutrality legislation. I am not surprised that there is a good deal of hysteria throughout the country. There is a lot of it in my district. And why should there not be a good deal of hysteria when we read items such as the one printed in the Washington Post a week ago yesterday, purporting to be a War Department release, in which it was stated that the War Department had sent men to Chicago to issue instructions on the duties of a draft board. These things stir people up. If the people read that instructions are going out to potential draft boards, they, of course, think that war is just around the corner.

They also read that control of the Panama Canal has been taken away from the civil body and turned over to the Army, whereas the Panama Canal Act states definitely that this shall be done only in case of war or when war is imminent. There, again, it is not surprising that those who are aware of this situation rightfully feel that in the opinion of their Government war is imminent.

Throughout all the thought I have been able to give to this subject of neutrality, and throughout the debate I have listened to in the other body, and the excellent addresses that have been made on this floor, there keeps recurring to my mind this thought, "If only we could be sure"; because I am positive there is not a man in this body or connected with this Government in any capacity who would willfully or intentionally do anything that would lead this country into war.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wish to inquire whether the gentleman does not believe it is a wise move on the part of our Government, in view of the espionage that is now going on in our own country, to take every precaution to preserve the Panama Canal and prevent any incident there that might obstruct it.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly, the Panama Canal should be protected, but I believe it could be protected under the control of the civilian authorities with the help of the Army. The Panama Canal Act very distinctly states that control shall be turned over to the Army only in case of war or when war is imminent. I do not feel that war is imminent and we do not want the people throughout the country to believe that this is a step taken because war is imminent, because to many that means just tomorrow.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is not a question of whether the civil or the military authorities do the work; it is a question of getting the results down there. It is highly important, as the gentleman will admit, to preserve the Panama Canal.

Mr. MILLER. Right; but I believe it could be done under civil authority.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does not the gentleman know that we have already convicted about eight or nine spies in this country representing foreign governments, who had in their possession certain plans for the purpose of destroying certain things that were quite important to our national defense?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; but most of those arrests and prosecutions were made by civil authorities and not by the military intelligence, and I believe control of the Panama Canal should have continued as it was.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do you not believe, in view of the fact which I have stated here two or three times, that we had at one time over 300 spies in this country representing foreign governments, that the Panama Canal would be the finest spot in the world to seek to destroy?

Mr. MILLER. I agree that it should have every possible protection. There is no doubt about that.

It seems to me considerable effort has been made on the part of some columnists to convey to the country the thought that this neutrality battle is all over. I read a few days ago—a week ago today, to be exact—an article by Jay Franklin appearing in a Washington paper, in which he said that the debate in the other body had petered out and that there

was only a lackadaisical interest in the debate on the neutrality resolution.

There is not a Member of this body who has gone over to the other body since the debate was opened but has seen a line extending all the way down stairs, with people from all over the country trying to get into the galleries. To be sure, there are empty seats, possibly, in the diplomatic gallery or certain sections that are reserved; but John Q. Public is very much interested in that debate, and the fight is far from over. All we have to do is to witness the interest evidenced on the part of the people who visit Washington, as well as those who write to us.

Before long we will have here in the House a Bloom bill; in fact, there is now nothing left of the Bloom bill as we passed it in the House but the title, and for that reason I have expressed the fear we will not have adequate debate when that bill comes back here.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Has there been any assurance given on the part of the leaders that some program is going to be worked out so that the bill can be debated fully?

Mr. MILLER. I have not had any such assurance, but I have confidence that the leaders on both sides of the House will insist on adequate debate under the rules of the House, and I will be very much surprised and disappointed if that does not happen.

There has been an effort on the part of a good many who have addressed themselves to the subject of repealing the arms embargo to misstate the issue now before the Congress. It is not a question of whether we shall repeal or whether we shall keep the arms embargo or whether we shall repeal it or shall accept the new resolution, House Joint Resolution 306. Certainly we can continue our arms embargo and then add other provisions or other measures that have been proposed that would certainly strengthen our neutrality. We can have the arms embargo and also have these other protective measures. The thing I am afraid of is that if we repeal the arms embargo we will start a chain of events that we cannot stop—a chain that will take us into war.

It has been said that the democracies of Europe are fighting our battle; that they are upholding democracy, that they are going to stop Hitler, that they are fighting our war. If there is any Member of the Congress who feels that is true, that it is a question of whether democracy shall survive, then why should we debate the provisions of a neutrality bill and discuss cash and carry? If I thought that on the outcome of this war depended the future and the continuation of democracy, as we know it in the United States, I would not waste any time discussing cash and carry. I would not say to those who are fighting our battles, "Yes, we will help you with munitions, providing you put the gold on the barrel head." If I felt that way I would be tempted to rush home and take the hand controls off the old "Chevy" and put them on an airplane and go over and fight our own battle.

I think this country and the world generally recognizes the difference between arms and ammunition and other commodities. Arms and ammunition fundamentally and primarily are commodities of death, but all other commodities are fundamentally commodities of life. The criticism has been offered that our neutrality does not go far enough, that we embargo arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and then permit the unfinished material to be shipped to Europe. As I read the Neutrality Act, as it is now on our books, I see no reason why the President cannot add to the embargo list those materials that can be used to make implements of war. As a matter of fact, I think under any reasonable definition, copper tubing could be held to be of like character to copper shells, and if it is the failure of our Government that we have not gone far enough, certainly we can go further without repealing the act.

I have been interested to read a good deal of the diplomatic correspondence that passed between this Government and the Governments of Great Britain and France between 1914 and 1917, and through all of that diplomatic correspondence what is the only subject of controversy? It is not wheat, it

is not cotton, not corn, but it is munitions—traffic in arms, and we find throughout that correspondence that that particular topic always recurs. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe and understand that our arms embargo is a symbol of honest neutrality. I ask you to think back to 1914, to 1917, and particularly during the fall of 1916, when President Wilson was re-elected on a platform or the slogan that he kept us out of war. I believe President Wilson was absolutely honest in his desire to keep this Nation out of war. I believe from reading the remarks of Members of Congress in this House, made in 1916, when they said they would support this measure or that measure, they would vote for this or that, but they would not vote to actually participate in war that they were sincere, and still, in less than 5 months from the time Mr. Wilson was elected in 1916, because of events beyond his control, we were actively in that war, and that is why I think there is very real danger that we are starting on a series of events, starting a chain of events, that will lead us into a position where we will have to eventually get into the war, that we will be taking the first step toward war if we repeal the embargo.

I shall read now a few quotations, very brief quotations, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and some from correspondence between our State Department and the British State Department. First I read from the memoirs of Lloyd George in which he said:

If we were interfering with America's potential trade with our enemies, at least we were providing her with a magnificent market in Britain, France, and Russia, which stimulated her industries to an unprecedented level of activity and profitability. This fact had its influence in holding back the hand of the American Government whenever, excited to intense irritation by some new incident of the blockade, it contemplated retaliatory measures.

Further I read:

Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost. While British diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders.

That is a quotation from the Life of Woodrow Wilson, by Ray Stannard Baker. Then further on we read of a cablegram sent by Ambassador Page to the Secretary of State in which he makes this dire prediction:

Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and panic averted. I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French Governments.

That is from a cablegram from our Ambassador to President Wilson.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, was not that message given to the President of the United States less than 1 month before President Wilson appeared in this Chamber and asked the Congress to declare war on Germany?

Mr. MILLER. Less than 1 month.

Thus by the end of 1914 traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of war had reached the vanishing point.

That from Ray Stannard Baker in his Life of Woodrow Wilson.

Now, is it not reasonable to say that if we repeal the arms embargo, in view of what took place in this country in 1914 to 1917, that we are, in all probability, taking the first step to war; that we are starting on a series of events which might well repeat the history of 1914 to 1917? That our whole economic set-up, that our industries, that our capitalistic structure will be geared up to supplying the European countries with war material, and no matter what happens we will find that we are facing a situation where we may then realize that we made a mistake in this special session, and we will



not be able to do anything about it in 1914, and more than could the Congress and the President in 1916 and early 1917.

I believe that this recent history is in the minds of those who say flatly that the repeal of the arms embargo is a step in the direction of participation in the existing war.

One more word about this thought that we do not go far enough in our embargo: At the present time we prohibit the sale of narcotics, but not other harmful drugs, such as veronal and barbitol, that we know are harmful; and then we find marihuana being sold throughout the country. But does anybody get up here and say we do not bar veronal or barbitol, and they are harmful to young people who are buying them, and wrecking their lives? Just because we do not bar those things nobody proposes that we lift the ban that we have on narcotics. Is it not just as reasonable to say that if we do not go far enough in our arms embargo, that the sensible thing is to go a little further? If those who feel that our present law is unneutral because Germany can obtain munitions coming from the United States, through other neutral countries, a very simple amendment would correct that evil, and it could be passed almost overnight. We would simply say that in the future we are going to embargo arms, ammunition, and implements of war to all countries. Then there will be no question of any of it getting into Germany illegally or getting into France and Great Britain illegally.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Gladly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, does not the gentleman believe that inasmuch as it is the belligerents themselves who determine for themselves and for the rest of the world what contraband of war is, that we should confine our embargoes to everything that either of the belligerents may determine to be contraband of war?

Mr. MILLER. I honestly believe that. I said on this floor in June that as far as I was concerned, the profit on our foreign business with those countries at war is such a comparatively small sum that if I could have my way I would stop doing business with countries during the period of time they were at war. I would not worry about any financial loss.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman have the figures, in dollars and cents, covering arms and ammunition purchased by France, Great Britain, and Germany prior to the declaration of World War No. 2?

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry I do not have them here.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Is it not true that an army marches on its stomach today, the same as it did in Napoleon's day?

Mr. MILLER. Of course it does; but I have tried to point out that in the minds of the people of this country and the world generally there is a difference between arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and food.

Mr. PATRICK. Where is the point of demarcation between the things that will aid a country at war and the things the gentleman first mentioned? In other words, if we follow the logic of embargo, why sell anything to any nation that is at war?

Mr. MILLER. I said I would like to do that.

Mr. PATRICK. Then, following that further, as other neutral nations do carry that on through, if the logic of the position taken by the gentleman is sound, why, then, when nations are at war, should this country sell anything to anybody?

Mr. MILLER. I just finished saying that is exactly what I would like to do, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] said he would like to embargo everything that is on the lists of the belligerent nations as contraband.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman will agree that the belligerents themselves determine what shall be considered contraband of war, and I just said so.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. I like what the gentleman has said. I like his philosophy today. I am particularly concerned with just exactly what his action would be if he would embargo everything to all warring nations, on the resulting unemployment, when I am mindful of the votes the gentleman cast when our W. P. A. bills were up here, to put 1,000,000 people off and refuse to put the other 1,000,000 on. I am wondering how the gentleman would react to that.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman's question by saying that the goods that we will deliver to the countries now at war during the period of time they are at war will not amount to the snap of a finger in our unemployment problem.

Mr. GEYER of California. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MILLER. It would not be the first time.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Connecticut realize that for the past 10 years 40 percent of our export trade went to the British Empire and Dominions?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I so understand. I would, however, rather pass that up than to have this country become involved in trade in the implements of war. In my opinion, we would be better off if we did not do business with belligerent nations at all during wartime, but at the same time I would insist that belligerent nations not interfere with our right to trade with neutrals. By developing trade with the neutrals we would far more than offset any loss we might sustain by stopping business with the belligerents.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman realize the disastrous effect of the embargo which was enforced in the administration of Thomas Jefferson? It nearly paralyzed our whole economy.

Mr. MILLER. There is a great difference of opinion about that. I do not think the gentleman's statement is necessarily absolutely correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman indulge me a moment further?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman really believe that the United States, dependent as it is on imports of tin, nickel, manganese, and rubber, can isolate itself from the rest of the world? Suppose, in retaliation for this complete embargo, which it virtually would be, these other nations cut off our imports of those essential raw materials?

Mr. MILLER. Has there been any threat of retaliation because of our embargo?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly they are not going to take it lying down.

Mr. MILLER. They have so far.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. KITCHENS. Does the gentleman realize that embargoes of one character or another have caused practically all the wars of the world?

Mr. MILLER. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Does the gentleman realize that if we were to embargo all these things it would have a tendency to drive that part of American industry which makes these munitions into foreign countries—into Argentina, Brazil, Canada—and that that would become a very live threat to our market in the depression that would follow the war? They would then put themselves in competition with our domestic manufacturers, and on the basis of competition get the greatest market in the world, the American

market. They would destroy our market by reason of their low-priced labor.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the gentleman that so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to banish from this country wartime trade in munitions.

As to the balance of the gentleman's question, I may say that I believe there is not a country in the world doing business with us today because they love us. They are buying from us because we have what they need at a price they can pay. They will continue doing so after the war is over.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That is true; but after the war the industries which have moved to those foreign countries will turn their machines from the manufacture of arms, armament, and ammunition into the manufacture of machinery and the commodities of peace, competing for the greatest market in the world. They will not bother us while war is on, but after the war is over they will flood our market with their cheap goods.

Mr. MILLER. Along that line let me read, in answer to the gentleman's question, what President Wilson said on the 26th day of October 1916 in a speech at Cincinnati, Ohio. He said:

If you take the figures of our commerce, domestic and foreign included, you will find that the foreign commerce, even upon a modest reckoning of our domestic commerce, does not include 4 percent of the total; and the exports in munitions—and not merely in munitions but in everything that goes to supply arms—draft animals, automobiles, trucks, food directly intended for that purpose, shoes, clothes, everything that is needed by the commissary of an army—that all of these things put together do not constitute 1 percent of the total of our commerce.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I realize that that is true, and I, too, do not care about the 1 percent of our exports. The thing in which I am interested and about which I am fearful is the 99 percent of our market and the way it will suffer from competition from the outside. Their cheap goods will be imported into this country; we will not export. Those cheap goods will have a disastrous effect on the 99 percent of our own home market.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman must remember that this is wartime, and those nations and people are not going to be bothering much about foreign trade while the war lasts.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. But after the war they will get it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. While the gentleman is interrupted will he yield briefly?

Mr. MILLER. Gladly.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like, only because I happen to have done exhaustive research work in the period of history covered by the Jefferson embargos, to correct at least in part the impression that is left by the statements that the Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts helped involve us in the War of 1812 and certain other sequences. It is a matter of record that the Jeffersonian embargo was put into effect in 1807 and continued in effect only until 1809. The Nonintercourse Act was adopted as regards England and France as economic sanctions in order to force France to withdraw the Berlin and Milan decrees and in order to force Great Britain to withdraw the famous orders in council. In other words, those two measures were basically designed as economic warfare against England and France. If we recall our history a bit further, England and France were notified that if they withdrew their restrictions regarding our commerce we would withdraw our restrictions regarding theirs.

In the year 1810 France, by subterfuge, withdrew the Berlin-Milan decrees, and we lifted the Nonintercourse Act as regards that country. We might as well know once and for all that the embargo under Jefferson was an economic sanction and not a neutrality measure. Further, we might as well know that the embargo only affected the commercial sections of our country, and while it was economic hardship on those

particular sections, the rest of the country suffered none at all in what was the most prosperous period, 1792 to 1812, in the history of the United States. I submit any reliable historian on that point.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I hope that in the next few days we can perhaps have that matter debated, because it is an interesting period in our history and of particular interest at this time.

Let us leave the subject we are discussing for the moment and direct our attention to the reasons this country had for the adoption of the Neutrality Act in 1935 and the amendments in 1936 and 1937. It seems to me that we adopted the neutrality law in 1935 for just one reason, because it was our thought it would be a step in the direction of keeping the United States out of some future foreign war. We never hoped it would stop wars in Europe, but we did hope, and I believe the Congress was right at that time, in believing it would keep us from becoming involved in any foreign wars.

Back of that I think the exposures of the Nye committee had a good deal to do with the action of the Congress at that time. Then, too, I think it was partly at least in response to requests of veterans' organizations in this country. I know for several years prior to 1935 the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars urged the adoption of a Neutrality Act. For these three reasons the bill was finally adopted in 1935, reenacted, approved, and amended in 1937.

There are many Members of the present Congress who voted for that Neutrality Act. I could insert in the RECORD editorials from newspapers in 25 leading cities of the United States approving the action of Congress in 1935 and 1937. The President of the United States in the strongest possible words approved the neutrality legislation in the Chautauqua, N. Y., address referred to by my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], where he made the much-discussed fool's gold speech.

It is well to be reminded of that, because the President in his message to Congress gave us as his unalterable opinion that repeal of the arms embargo would most likely keep us out of war. He based that statement on the fact that he had for a number of years been a student of international affairs and world peace. It is reasonable for all of us to believe that the major part of that "large number of years" or "long number of years" must have been prior to 1936. Yet in 1936 he said that this neutrality legislation had put new tools in his hands, tools he could use to keep us out of some future war. He issued the warning that the thing we had to fear most if war broke out on some other continent was the fact there would be thousands in this country who, through a desire for fool's gold, would urge repeal or evasion of the Neutrality Act. It is tragic to think of those who felt that way in 1936 now leading the move to repeal the act, perhaps not for fool's gold. I would not for a moment charge, and I do not think, that the President of the United States would willfully and intentionally do anything to involve us in a war.

However, being human, I think he may err, and from that error—and I believe this House has certainly indicated a belief that a repeal of the embargo would be an error—we might become involved in war.

In the President's message and in some addresses made on the floor of the House it has been urged that we repeal the arms embargo, repeal certain other parts of our Neutrality Act, and go back to international law. Most of us know that international law is simply what the most powerful nation in the world, the nation having control of the seas, chooses to say it is. It is rather interesting to note what one of the leading proponents of the new resolution had to say about our relying on international law in 1937. Speaking at the University of Nevada, Senator PITTMAN said:

They proclaim we shall rely on international law. We will have our own restraining laws during war. We relied upon international law prior to the World War, and it was our undoing.

What has happened since to change the minds of these people who felt just 2 short years ago that to rely on international law would be our undoing, as it was in 1917?



I would like to ask this question, and I pause for any Member of Congress to answer: Is there any Member of this House who voted for the Neutrality Act of 1937 who heard any great amount of criticism of his vote when he went back home? I did not hear any. The man who represented the district I now represent came back and, like most of the Members of Congress in 1936 to 1938, was proud of his part in placing on our statute books the neutrality law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Quite to the contrary. The Members of Congress who voted for the Neutrality Act were praised by their people for enacting a law which was one step in the direction of keeping this country out of any foreign conflict.

Mr. MILLER. It was used by Members of this House on both sides. They were proud of the part they played in the writing of that legislation.

It has been stated during the discussions we have had in the House that we should have dealt with this subject last June; that we should have passed the Bloom bill; then we would not have had to come back in special session. Still, it is said that one of the most important parts of this new resolution is the restriction on our shipping. The record of this House will show that if there is any responsibility for leaving the subject of the restriction of shipping out of the Bloom bill, that responsibility must lay with the majority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, page 7990, the words of my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], where he stated:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I am authorized to announce, in order to eliminate certain features of the bill which are objectionable to some Members of the House, the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. Bloom], after consulting with a majority of the Democratic members of the committee, and with their concurrence and support, will offer amendments to change the bill as reported in the following particulars:

(1) In section 2 of the bill, strike out the provision making it unlawful for citizens of the United States to travel on vessels of belligerent nations, and substitute in lieu thereof "that no citizen of the United States shall travel upon vessels of belligerent nations, except at his own risk."

(2) Strike out all of section 3, relating to areas of combat operations.

If we had passed the Bloom bill as it was recommended to this House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in my humble opinion, we would still have been called back in special session to enact these necessary shipping restrictions.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Briefly.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Is it not also true that administration forces took out section 9, which made it unlawful for American ships to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents?

Mr. MILLER. I believe so; I am not sure.

There is no question in anybody's mind but that the vast majority of the citizens of this country have a very strong feeling in favor of the Allies, in favor of Britain and France, and that they want to see Hitler defeated, and Hitlerism and all it stands for eliminated from the face of the earth. With this sentiment I wholeheartedly agree. Let the most profane man in this House express his opinion of Hitlerism, and I will gladly accept it without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

While it may be all right and undoubtedly is all right, although not good psychology, for the people of this country to have that strong feeling, I do believe that when a Member of Congress comes up on Capitol Hill and goes to his office, or comes through the door onto this floor, he should bear in mind, always, that he is dealing with friendly nations. As far as I know, our diplomatic relations are not even strained with any nation on the face of the earth. We must keep before us the thought that we as Members of Congress, at least, are writing legislation that will affect not unfriendly but at least at the present time friendly nations.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has expressed his abhorrence of Hitlerism.

Mr. MILLER. Right.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman realize that the present arms embargo certainly plays into the hands of Hitler?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know. I believe I can prove that it does not.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Some nations are strong land powers.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Will the gentleman allow me to come to that point a little later? I have it here. If I do not cover it, I shall be pleased then to yield to the gentleman.

As we go on in this debate, I think I can truthfully say I do not care a rap what effect our legislation may have on Britain, France, Germany, Russia, or any other country on the face of the earth; but it does seem to me that we are reaching the point in this discussion, judging from the discussions on the radio, in the other body, and on this floor, where the question is becoming, not one of neutrality, but of how far we can go in "an act short of war" to aid the side the majority of our people want to see win. Let me quote very briefly statements made during this debate on the radio and elsewhere by leaders of the group that favor repeal; statements that, in my humble opinion, indicate that these men are not neutral and are not trying to write a neutrality act, but instead are trying to write legislation that will aid the Allies. I quote:

Americans must do everything they can to hasten the victory of the Allies.

That by a Member of Congress, who must vote on this bill. Is that neutrality? Maybe it is right, but it is not neutrality.

We must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies. We do not need to ask whether the bill is neutral.

And again:

The present law is not working neutrally in Europe.

And again:

Let us forget impartiality, hence neutrality, and take sides and fight.

In my humble opinion, that is not neutrality.

The Neutrality Act to which today we are considering amendments never was a neutrality act. It should have been called an act to keep the United States out of war.

In the name of all that is holy, what is the matter with that? If that is what the act is that we have on our statute books, then let us not amend it; let us not repeal it; let us keep the act we have which, as one opponent of repeal says, is an act to keep the United States out of war.

Another quotation:

It favors the belligerents that we want favored by giving them a chance of coming here with their ships and buying our goods.

Then the quotation goes on that the present law has not worked neutrally in Europe.

It was said yesterday that we give aid to the aggressor and deny it to the victims of the aggressor. Those were not the exact words of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, who expressed it much better than I can, but that was his thought—that we before the war aided in the arming of Hitler and now we have denied to his victims the munitions they may need.

These points are easy to check. It is interesting to note that in the last 8 months this country has shipped abroad a total of \$58,500,000 worth of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, \$22,664.94 of which went to Germany and the balance to Great Britain, France, and her allies. If that is all that is bothering us, as I said in the early part of my remarks, a simple amendment barring the shipment of munitions to neutrals would carry out our purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Germany did not have to come over here and buy those arms from us. She took them

when she took Czechoslovakia and Austria. She took the great munitions factories of Europe by aggression.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman that 2 years ago, which was before Hitler took Czechoslovakia, Germany was armed to the teeth, and I think the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman answer one question for me?

Mr. MILLER. If I can; yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that Hitler wants the present arms embargo repealed or maintained?

Mr. MILLER. Well, if I answer that with just the thought that comes to my mind, you may say that I am rude, but I honestly feel that I do not give a darn what he wants. [Applause.] I do not mean to be rude.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does not his attitude or the attitude of his controlled press show that the arms embargo is a great aid to him at the present time?

Mr. MILLER. The controlled press?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. His controlled press.

Mr. MILLER. That is something that we might be able to debate in the next few days, and the thought was expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I believe yesterday, that because of the submarines in the Atlantic it was quite possible that the shipment of munitions through the Pacific and then into Germany would be much easier than such shipments to the Allies, which was an interesting thought.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for 2 years, does not the gentleman think that we exhibited a good deal of short-sighted statesmanship in this Chamber in not visualizing in advance the exact situation that confronts us today?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows how I feel from the amendment which I offered at the last session.

Mr. MILLER. I was coming to that and was going to say that when the matter was before the Congress in 1935 and 1937, we knew then that Great Britain and France were sea powers and that Germany was a land power, and that these other land powers conceded that they were going to be the victims of the Versailles Treaty, and the proponents of the Versailles Treaty knew that. We knew that in 1935 and 1937, and still we wrote the law, knowing that and knowing what the most likely outbreak was going to be.

I think I have time for just about one more thought. Within 48 hours of the opening of this session I made inquiry of our State Department and asked one of the able men over there if he would suggest to me four or five names of men whom they considered outstanding authorities on international law, because I am not even a common garden variety of lawyer and I wanted some good advice. I had submitted to me five names—Professors Jessup and Hyde, of Columbia, and Professors Beamis and Griswold, of Yale, and another one whose name I do not recall, but he was secretary of the Wickersham committee in 1926, a committee appointed to codify international law. I wrote these gentlemen and asked them whether, in their opinion, repeal of the arms embargo under existing circumstances would be an unneutral or an unfriendly act, and all five of them said it would be, and Professors Jessup and Hyde have outlined their position in letters appearing in the New York Times, which have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is interesting to note that they all agree that we cannot repeal the arms embargo, but none of them say that we cannot change our Neutrality Act. We can change our Neutrality Act to strengthen it, but we cannot change it in order to help one or the other of the belligerents, and this, in my opinion, is the difference between repealing the embargo and putting into effect the cash-and-carry provisions on other commodities that may be just as useful, because the cash and carry is distinctly a strengthening of our neutrality, and writing into law the terms under which we will sell those commodities, and it does not in any way deprive any nation from getting supplies, because every Member of the House knows that every

country can, if it wants to, put its money on the line for the supplies they need from the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Would the gentleman tell us in dollars and cents how much was spent by the Allies in this country during the first World War for guns and ammunition?

Mr. MILLER. I have not the figures here.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while I cannot answer the question as the gentleman from Kansas puts it, I can say that our sale of arms and ammunition amounted to less than 10 percent of our total exports.

Mr. MILLER. I was going to say that I think we overrate arms and ammunition, and, as a matter of fact, many of the Members here will remember that we could not furnish our own arms and ammunition even when that war closed because we were still using French planes and French guns.

Mr. HOUSTON. And we were drilling our soldiers with broomsticks.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not think in the event of repealing this law we will sell any guns and ammunition to amount to a tinker's dam.

Mr. MILLER. Yesterday my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] expressed the thought that repeal would improve our national defense. The effect repeal of the arms embargo would have upon our national defense is one thing that would cause me to vote against repeal, and I base that statement on the experience of 1914 to 1917, because we find in 1917, when we went to war, that our munition factories were geared up and tooled up for foreign governments. Most of those factories were in my own State of Connecticut, and when our own Government wanted rifles we found that it would take so long to change over from the tooling necessary for Enfield to turn out Springfields that our own Government had to take Enfields, admitting that they were an inferior rifle; and when we were discussing the preparation for bringing our aircraft up to the strength we think it should have it was brought out that it would be impossible to meet our own needs in less than a year, and I am informed by the best opinion that I can get that, with our own aircraft industry geared up as it is, it will take about 14 months to turn out our own needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLK). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Has the gentleman in mind answering the question put a moment ago, whether the keeping of the embargo is and will be a definite aid to Hitler?

Mr. MILLER. I shall try to answer it. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am waiting for that answer, as it is a matter of great interest to me. I certainly do not want to aid the dictators. I hold that our own long-range interests and safety are paramount.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think it has any effect on Hitler. I think Hitler is armed to the teeth and that with their resources they do not need our munitions.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I wanted to get the gentleman's view on that point.

Mr. MILLER. It is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I do not want to interrupt the interesting discussion, but is it not a well-known fact that there are many airplanes now on the Atlantic border ready to be shipped across the ocean if the embargo is repealed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.



Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Is not that an aid to Hitler, in denying England and France those planes?

Mr. MILLER. I may be all wrong, but I have tried my best to find out, and I honestly doubt that there is any shortage of airplanes or munitions in either Great Britain or France, and the probabilities are that there will not be for at least a year. I think they are well equipped for a year, which would cause me to believe that there is no need for rushing into this thing. Circumstances may change, and, rather than see Hitler win, we might want to take some other position.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Is it not a well-known fact that they have millions of money in this country, put here months ago, with which they bought these planes?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. And if what you say is true, why did they buy many planes many months ago?

Mr. MILLER. For a long war, I would say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They have been selling us gold for the last 4 years and we have been paying them a premium of \$14 an ounce on it. They have sold about \$8,000,000,000 worth of it—

Mr. MILLER. Let us not get into gold. [Laughter.] I would like to insert this letter in the RECORD. It tends to prove that our Government in 1915 took the position that to repeal the arms embargo, or in that case it was to put on an arms embargo, would be an unneutral act. I want to quote from this letter of the Secretary of State in 1915, in which he replied to Germany's objection to our furnishing ammunition to the Allies. The Secretary of State said:

This Government holds that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality. The placing of an embargo on the trading in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States.

It is just as true today, in reverse English, as it was in 1915. It has been said on this floor that every other neutral who can do so, is selling arms to warring nations; particularly, it has been emphasized, to Hitler. There again I sat down and wrote to 12 of the embassies in Washington and asked them what legislation their countries had and whether they were embargoing arms at the present time, and in some cases whether they did during the World War. I found out from those various embassies that at the present time Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, the Netherlands, and numerous South American countries are not permitting the shipment of arms, munitions, or implements of war beyond their own borders. Most of them are what we would like to think of as the great neutral powers of Europe. It is with those powers and countries like that, countries like Switzerland, that I want to see the United States at least tied up with in thought.

Now, suppose the Congress in its wisdom decides, whether it is neutral or not, we are going to pass this resolution, and we do not care whether it is neutral. I would like to direct attention to the Pacific coast, because I am sure the people of this country who want to aid Britain and France do not want to aid Japan. That is just what you will do if you repeal the arms embargo, because you take away from Japan the only excuse they have for not declaring war. They would then declare war, and in the Pacific Japan is the country that controls the sea, and China, the victim of the aggressor, is the country that will suffer. We cannot legislate for the Atlantic in one way and for the Pacific in another. I would like to have time to develop the effect of repeal of the arms embargo on Japan. Perhaps that can be done at some other time.

One other thought: About 10 days following the address of the President of the United States to Congress, I went to the Library to see if I could find out the reaction of the European press, because, after all, we like to know what the people of the world are thinking about us. Without exception, every paper I found took the position, and I think rightfully so, that the United States was taking sides; that we were going

in with our own Allies to a limited extent; that we were going into the war on the economic front against Germany.

That came up in 1914 to 1917. It is surprising how many of these things we face today we can find the answer to in the history of 1914 to 1917. On May 8, the day after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, Ambassador Page reported that the official opinion in Great Britain was that the United States must declare war or forfeit her self-respect. The President said it was a serious thing to have such things thought, because everything that affects the opinion of the world regarding us affects our influence for good. That is just as true today.

I saw an interesting quotation the other day from the Windsor Daily Star, in which they say that the arms-embargo clause of the Neutrality Act will be repealed "for a starter" and "next, America will be in the war along about the middle of January."

If I can express just one closing thought: I hope that we can try to keep our feet on the floor; that we will not be influenced by partisanship, and that we will not get unreasonable. I saw a statement the other day referring to Lindbergh's speech the other night in which it stated, "Lindbergh's speech encourages the ideology of the totalitarian government and is subject to the construction that he approves of the brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or the threat of destruction through war." It is those unfavorable and unreasonable statements that affect the thinking of this body and the people of our country. To say that anything that was said in Lindbergh's speech could fairly have that construction put on it is beyond me.

So I just want to express this thought: That while we are waiting for the other body perhaps we can give some thought and consideration to the matter that is now before the Dies committee. In other words, that we put our own house in order; that we can remove from this country those who are here in an effort to undermine our Republic, to spread nazi-ism and communism; and if we would direct our efforts to that there would not be any time wasted and we would be very busy Members of the House between now and the time the bill comes from the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Why do not those of you who oppose repeal of the embargo, in order to be consistent, insist on the embargoing of all goods that may be considered contraband?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman was here during the last hour he will remember that I said definitely that I certainly did favor that.

Speaking of embargoes, many of us seem to have forgotten that we have an embargo on helium gas, but I hear no agitation to withdraw it because that would help another side from the side many proponents of repeal want to help.

I thank the Members of the House for their attention. As I said, I had no words of wisdom, but if I have created a little thought and discussion it has been worth while. I know I have enjoyed these informal discussions very much this past week, and I hope they may continue. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### WAR AND THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables to which I refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the country, and particularly the House of Representatives, has become so absorbed, so excited, about the war now raging in Europe that I fear we are forgetting some of the important things relating to our country here at home. We have some very serious domestic problems, and much as we may be interested in the question of neutrality, we must not forget those large groups in this country which, perhaps, are suffering great injury at the present time.

While the debates in the Senate concerning the embargo are attracting national attention, a situation has come about of which the administration must be cognizant, and which threatens the gravest damage to American agriculture and American manufacturing.

Unobserved, undetected, amid the excitement of the conflict abroad and the discussion of the proposal to repeal the embargo, this situation concerning the trade treaties has not only come about but has practically reversed, in our trade with several countries, the position of the United States—to the grave detriment of agriculture and manufacturing interests.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, believe it is of exceeding importance to expose this situation to the gaze of the country at this time. It has already come to my attention that industrial leaders are much alarmed over this and are endeavoring to set up machinery to protect them from day to day against impending disaster. Unfortunately, the farmers of this country have no means of setting up such instrumentalities to protect themselves. The Congress of the United States is their only hope. Are we going to neglect them? Are we going to abandon them to the ravages of foreign competition?

I want the Members who are interested in this farm problem to give thought and attention to this. I must admit that these things had not occurred to me until a few days ago, but I know how the dairymen in northern New York and other parts of the United States are suffering these days; I know how hard they are pinched; I know that our farm markets are being invaded, and there must be some reason why this is so at this special time.

The major effects of any war are felt by the belligerent nations. There are, however, serious repercussions which materially affect the trade and commerce of neutral nations. New forces are brought into play which make it necessary for every country to examine its trade policy in light of changed conditions, and trade conditions are changing with lightning rapidity.

For 5 years the United States has been operating under the reciprocal trade agreements program. This program was designed to increase our foreign trade by reducing American import duties in return for which foreign countries reduced duties on goods from the United States. These treaties were concluded in peacetime and assumed a continuation of normal trade and economic activity in the world. Even in normal times the agreements have proved a real hardship to many American producers. Since hostilities began, new elements have entered the picture which should provide additional hardships to domestic producers.

By far the most important immediate effect of the war is the depreciation of foreign currencies in relation to the American dollar. Thus it will be noted that from November 19, 1938, to September 15, 1939, less than a year, the British pound declined 21.1 percent in relation to the dollar; the French franc declined 66.8 percent from May 9, 1936, to September 15, 1939, in relation to the dollar; and the Canadian dollar declined 9.7 percent from November 19, 1938, to September 15, 1939, to mention only a few examples.

The following table shows all the European countries with which agreements have been concluded, and Canada; the date of signing the agreements; the average weekly exchange quotation most closely approximating the date of signing; the exchange quotation as of September 15, 1939; and the percentage change between the two periods:

[In dollars]

Country	Date agreement signed	Average weekly exchange quotation	Exchange quotation on Sept. 15, 1939	Percent change
Belgium	Feb. 27, 1935	0.2350 (Feb. 23, 1935)	0.1706	-27.4
Sweden	May 25, 1935	.2563 (May 25, 1935)	.2382	-7.1
Netherlands	Dec. 20, 1935	.6790 (Dec. 21, 1935)	.5316	-21.7
Switzerland	Jan. 9, 1936	.3278 (Jan. 11, 1936)	.2263	-31.0
France	May 6, 1936	.065834 (May 9, 1936)	.0219	-66.8
Finland	May 18, 1936	.0220 (May 16, 1936)	.0203	-7.7
United Kingdom	Nov. 17, 1938	4.72 1/2 (Nov. 19, 1938)	3.73	-21.1
Canada	do.	.9921 (Nov. 19, 1938)	.8962	-9.7

Source: The Annalist, annual numbers for 1936, 1937, and 1938; the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1939.

Depreciation of one country's currency in relation to another imposes a heavy burden on the country whose currency remains at the old level. The effect is two edged. In the first place, it raises the price of American goods to foreign buyers in terms of their own money. As an example, if an article costs \$5 in American money, English merchants formerly were able to obtain it for approximately £1. Today the same article would cost approximately £1 1/4, a 20-percent increase in price. Not only should this mean a decline in demand for American goods but also a large diversion of trade from the United States to other countries which compete for the British market in the same goods. As an example, prior to the British-American agreement, Canadian lumber enjoyed a 10-percent preference in the British market. Under the terms of the agreement, this preference was reduced to 4 1/2 percent. Even under this rate, American lumber producers had real difficulty competing with Canada. Today, however, Canada's preference is greater than at any time. The Canadian dollar has depreciated 9.7 percent in relation to the American dollar. Add to this the preference of 4 1/2 percent and Canada has what amounts to a preference of over 14 percent.

The second and most important effect of trading with countries having depreciated currencies is the new ease with which they can sell to us. Depreciation of one currency in relation to another has the effect of reducing the price of articles imported in terms of United States dollars, or, expressed in another way, of reducing the tariff on the articles. As an example, if an article cost £1 in England, American importers had to pay \$4.72 for it at the time of signing the agreement. Today, however, this article costs but \$3.73. Carrying the example further, if the duty on the article is 10 percent ad valorem, the total cost of the article to the American importer at the time of signing the agreement would have been \$5.19. Today this same article, after payment of duty, costs but \$4.10, 62 cents less than it would have cost had the article been duty free a year ago. Thus we are actually subsidizing imports of goods which we produce.

There is a partial remedy for this situation. In all the agreements concluded with the European countries and Canada, provision is made for termination of the agreement if at any time variations should occur in exchange rates which either Government considers so substantial as to prejudice its industries or commerce. This is, of course, a discretionary provision as Congress set no limits of variation. It would seem, however, that variations of 7 to 67 percent would eliminate all exercise of discretion and make negotiation mandatory.

It will be said by many that, though depreciation would impose hardships on American producers in normal times, in times of war belligerents are too busy supplying their own needs and neutrals are supplementing belligerent needs rather than trading with other neutrals. Experience in the World War, however, does not bear this out. From 1913 to 1919, United States dutiable imports increased 46.1 percent. Dutiable crude foodstuffs, however, increased 101.9 percent and dutiable manufactured foodstuffs increased 165.2 percent. Over this same period dutiable finished manufactures declined 18.8 percent.

Total imports of dutiable goods and imports of selected dutiable economic groups, 1913 and 1919

	1913	1919	Percent change
Total	\$825,484,000	\$1,205,662,000	+46.1
Crude foods, etc.	31,917,000	64,444,000	+101.9
Manufactured foods	183,354,000	488,304,000	+165.2
Finished manufactures	311,067,000	252,602,000	-18.8
All other dutiable imports	299,156,000	402,312,000	+34.5

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States.

This adequately indicates the conduct of belligerents during war. Crude materials and foodstuffs require little manpower and are thus used to build up foreign exchange with which to buy finished manufactures, which require many men and heavy plant investment. The heaviest part of the burden, therefore, will probably be borne by the farmer. Canada, possessed of valuable tariff concessions and a depreciated



currency, may well flood this country with agricultural products in sufficient volume to break our prices.

In conclusion, a program which permits goods from countries which have depreciated currencies to enter the United States at duties which in many cases have been reduced 50 percent is diametrically opposed to the best interests of American agriculture and industry, and the State Department should avail itself of the privilege of negotiation or repeal of the various agreements looking toward fairer treatment of American producers.

Mr. Speaker, unless the administration moves forthwith to terminate the affected treaties, then the only hope of American agriculture is for the Congress to refuse to renew this policy when the act expires in June 1940.

If it were not for the fact that this special session will consider no subject other than neutrality, I would introduce a resolution calling upon the administration to exercise the right to terminate the treaties in accordance with their provisions for the protection of our domestic interests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a matter of fact, we know about as well as we know anything that the State Department—and the administration, too, for that matter—is going to march straight ahead in the consummation of these trade agreements. Taking the gentleman's presentation here, which I think is an outstanding one, we find the following situation: Our State Department this very day is holding hearings on the Argentine trade proposal. In the August 23 announcement, Under Secretary of State Welles said that he feels that the consummation of that trade agreement will be one of the outstanding accomplishments of this administration in the field of international relations. He takes the position that this is the opportune moment in which to consummate the agreement. He takes the position that it will accelerate and better perfect the good-neighbor policy. The Secretary also takes the position that the trade agreement is necessary in order for us to regain trade which was taken away from us at our expense by "certain European countries," as he designates them. When we get into the inside of the proposition, however, it appears that England went to Argentina and said: "We propose to invest hundreds of millions and perhaps one or two billions of dollars in your territory; we are your largest customer; we take the greatest percentage of your total exports; we, therefore, want you to allocate certain amounts of your exchange, which is created by our investment and our buying of your goods, for the purchase of English-made goods."

I now want to submit this question to the gentleman from New York: If England is to ship manufactured goods to Argentina as best she can under the circumstances, if England is to continue investing great sums of pounds sterling in Argentina, as she has done heretofore, on what ground can the State Department hope to recover the trade of Argentina in our favor as against its going to Britain, when we are not in position and when it is not our policy to make similar investments in Argentina, when it is not our policy to purchase from Argentina the foodstuffs and the raw agricultural products which England necessarily must have; in other words, is there not a fallacy in the State Department's proposal to put into operation trade agreements at this time which brings in only agricultural products to compete with the American farmer? Will the gentleman comment on that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. Any time a person takes the floor here and states his honest opinion in regard to the effect of trade agreements, there is a certain group here that feels he is talking politics. I am interested in the farmers of the country. I represent a farm district and I know they are

the backbone of the country. I also know their market is being taken away from them and laudable as the idea may be on the part of the men down there in the office of the Secretary of State, who think they are going to placate these people in South America, that they are going to create a greater trade and finer international relations, that may be true, but just so long, of course, as we will furnish the money, just so long as we will lend them money, and just so long as we will give them our hide and our soul they will smile and applaud us. Let me give you one thought in this 1 minute, and this is a rule you can put down as absolutely sound. The buyers of the world are going to buy where they can buy the cheapest, where there is the lowest cost of production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Does the gentleman think that returning to the high protective tariff of 1930 will restore trade relations to what they were in 1929, or would that follow the action that took place after the 1930 tariff?

Mr. REED of New York. As I stated, just the minute you talk about a trade agreement, or the tariff itself, of course, you immediately get into a political discussion. If you are really and truly interested in the welfare of your country and dismiss politics, you must then admit that we have the best cash market in the world. There is only one answer. If you are going to keep that market for your people, you have to protect it. If you open it wide to the rest of the world, you are going to injure the farmers of this country.

Mr. HARE. We tried that in 1930, I think.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to say one thing more in regard to the question of buying. It so happens that away back in December of 1917 I sat in a group of men who were interested in conducting the war in England. It was a round-table discussion. It was a luncheon. I happened to sit next to the man who did all of the buying of the food for the British Empire during the war. He told me with great enthusiasm that they had contracted for all the beef they would need from South America for 4 years of war. Why were they doing that? Because they could get a better bargain. They will do it with everything else they may need. They will go into the market where they can buy the cheapest. We must not import foodstuffs to the detriment of our own farmers. The only ones who made anything out of the last war prices to speak of at all were the speculators. The farmers did not get a high price for their wheat. The speculators had contracted for it at a low price. They extended their acreage, just as your own President said at Chautauqua last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], who has time to address the House?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes. Let him talk as long as the Members will listen to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] for his courtesy.

I want to back up what the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said in his speech just now concluded. There are several Members here who were present yesterday at the

hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The Senator from Texas made the statement at that time that had he known what he knows today he would never have voted for an extension of the right given to the administration to enter into trade agreements. He further stated he regrets today his vote upon that issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction, my personal opinion, that the proposed Argentine trade agreement is one of the most serious questions facing the Nation today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday of next week, after the reading of the Journal and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

#### NEUTRALITY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, my reason for getting this time today is to discuss with you the subject we all have on our minds, the subject the whole country is talking over at this time, neutrality. Everybody is thinking about it. What the people of the country want is a workable neutrality, not merely a theoretical neutrality.

The Europe of today is suffering a relapse into the Europe of yesterday. The lion and the unicorn are at it again. They have been at it repeatedly for several thousand years and are at it again. It is a temptation to us to say, "What will happen to us if the lion wins or if the unicorn wins?" and then start trimming our sails with an eye to this or that result; but I suppose to be 100-percent neutral we should have to deny ourselves of even this privilege.

The country we live in and the people for whom we are voice and vote here today have convinced us of one thing, that they do not wish to get into any war, so the question up to us is simply this: How are we going to handle this matter? How may we conduct our business so that we stand the slightest chance of getting into the war? How should we as Representatives of this Nation behave ourselves? How may we best recognize peril and avoid its consequences? These are merely different ways of stating this one question. America is anxious for peace and is willing to behave itself so that it may hold onto peace, but that may be a great deal more easily said than done.

Our imagination is moved as we see the peoples of Europe dancing around the spluttering powder keg as we witness the ceaseless conflict, the confusion of purpose, strange echoes of controversies that ought to have been long forgotten, leaders willing to see a world on fire rather than give up a point, the mad desires; yet all this is our own world, our own little world, the world we live in. These are our kinsmen; indeed, the folks from whom we sprang, relatives, and we must live with them and deal with them as neighbors and be thankful to high heaven the ocean is as broad as it is. We must watch for the guiding light of our star of safety and lift our hearts to the Lord of Hosts. We must seek the best peace counsel, but what is the best peace counsel? What is before us? What are the conditions of our present embargo law and how does it work? What does it purport to do and what does it actually do? Does it do what it is set up to accomplish? What is this cash-and-carry amendment so anxiously recom-

mended by the President and the Secretary of State and how will it work? Are the Senators and Congressmen, representing the people in Washington, running about, one bunch trying to do everything the President says without due consideration and another group opposing the President regardlessly? What is the whole picture here?

To begin with, this war does not look like any breakfast spell. It looks as if the world is in for a long, hard, heavy war—one that will take an awful toll. We in this Nation must make plans that will stand up and endure the whole siege and still hold us in peace and security, even when the noise of a warring world is thundering in our ears; all no doubt through long months and through peculiar shifts and changes that we cannot see or understand. We must watch that we do not do that which seems neutral today, but which plants seeds that will prick us tomorrow. We must consider the probable rebound and the natural reaction of every blow we strike today for peace and neutrality.

Our primary question is the proposed repeal of the arms-embargo section of the Neutrality Act. As you know, this act was adopted by Congress and became law in 1935. Then, in 1935, there was added to the law the cash-and-carry provision, inspired, I believe, by the war at that time going on in Spain.

The act then underwent an overhauling at the hands of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and then became the law of the land. The main amendment inserted in the 1937 act dealt with a certain commodity embargo; indeed, it was a cash-and-carry provision. Remember, this was in 1937. This provision prevented any shipment of general supplies and commodities under our flag on any vessel of ours to any nation at war.

Unfortunately, however, when passed, this cash-and-carry provision was placed on only a 2-year basis, and, again unfortunately, it expired on May 31 of this year. Then was when our present law took on its present status. Very many persons who have written and wired their Congressmen and who are still doing so do not seem to know this, a fact often revealed by their communications. So I am afraid that Mr. Fish's specially built committee overlooked the active emphasis on this point. The group hatched up here by Mr. Fish; that is, under the special Fish hatchery, has perhaps not covered the entire ground. Of course, there is a lot of ground to cover; it encircles the globe.

The neutrality law as it now stands allows any and all of the makings of munitions of war to be shipped to any or all fighting countries right today, on our vessels, manned by our seamen, under our flag, and that is now being done every hour. The cash-and-carry plan would not allow this. It would not permit anything to be shipped to a warring country.

As you know, the bill under consideration is House Joint Resolution 306.

Here is exactly how that part of it reads. This is section 2 (a) of the cash-and-carry plan:

It shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

Then section 1 (a) provides that upon a proclamation of the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution declaring a state of war to be in existence, the cash-and-carry proposal is to be levied against any nation involved.

They not only can, but now are, doing a tremendous traffic on the seas. This is one hundredfold more dangerous than the cash-and-carry plan that is proposed. Let us suppose something happens that is most likely to happen. I know we are not convinced by one of these remote things that may happen, but let us take as an analogy a thing that not only can happen, but is most likely to happen. Suppose under the embargo as it stands, a shipment is going from America to the heart of Europe, which is being done now in our ships, and suppose when it gets out it may have on it mercuriochrome, iodine, or other medicines, or it may have foodstuffs, or may have the makings of the high explosives that are instruments of death, for that matter. As a matter of fact,



as far as the facts are concerned, one may now put on one vessel everything required to make the most deadly instrumentality of war, just so you put one thing in one part of the vessel and one thing in another; and you know the nations of Europe are not going to order from us, in the first place, if they have the makings in their own nation.

So that is the trouble with an embargo. Embargo legislation was entered into in good faith by Thomas Jefferson. He espoused the cause, and it was begun as a partial embargo and in developing the theory they made it a long embargo, and you remember they called it the "O grab me law," and New England threatened to secede from the Union before it was over. That was one flag of Thomas Jefferson that did trail in the dust, and in the very last months of his administration he worked hard to wipe that blot, as far as he could, from the escutcheon of his administration.

So when we analyze it, the embargoes are not so good.

Now, take the example. What would happen? If a vessel got out on the high seas, beyond the 3-mile limit, manned by American boys, floating the American flag, and it was scuttled and sent to the bottom, what would be the reaction here? Warlike, indeed. We would wail that the American flag had gone under the waters. Streamer headlines would be in all our papers and in our motion picture shows, and in a little while with two or three affairs like that happening we know what the result would be—war.

Then take the cash-and-carry plan and let the same thing happen, even though it were a loaded cannon or assembled armored planes or motortrucks, and the vessel should get beyond the 3-mile limit only to be mined or torpedoed and blown up on the high seas. What would be the reaction here—warlike? No, indeed. No; our ship would not be sunk, our boys would not be drowned, our flag would not be sent beneath the waters. We would have the money, and it would not be our vessel and, therefore, there would be no reaction of consequence.

This is the reason, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the President said that this is the peaceful way, and I ask you what sense there is to a theory that, with over 10,000,000 people now out of work here, we shall hold to a law that results in having things done in Europe and Canada and other places that would ordinarily come here where the manufacturing should naturally be done? What is the difference, in the last analysis?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, I yield to the able Congressman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am interested to know if the gentleman contends that the arms embargo provision of our present law is in itself unneutral and, if so, why? And what is the gentleman's opinion as to the reason for this urgency for the repeal of that provision of the law, and entering upon the sale of our war materials?

Mr. PATRICK. I shall gladly answer that.

Mr. COX. In other words, if the gentleman will permit me to amplify the question, is the matter we are now considering, in the opinion of the gentleman, really in the interest of peace, or is it an effort to obtain business, and to express a sympathy for England and France at the risk of the peace and security of this Nation?

Mr. PATRICK. The repeal of the present embargo and the enactment of the cash-and-carry plan that will let us sell our own stuff, and sell it at our own door, is, in my opinion, more free from any element of intervention than any other course open to us; and when it comes to a practical application of it, it is less hypocritical than any other system that has been advanced, and is directed more logically and consistently toward peace than anything else advanced.

Mr. COX. Are we attempting to promote peace or advance the needs of business?

Mr. PATRICK. We are endeavoring to advance the cause of peace; but, incidentally, since this comes up, and does no harm—and it may be that it is not wise psychologically to discuss it—business can be taken care of and peace advanced at the same time. But in the event that that does not follow, I would strike out the business bid first.

Mr. COX. How are we advancing the cause of peace when we associate ourselves with one of the belligerents? In other words—

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, all right; the gentleman has asked enough. The gentleman from Georgia has asked as much as I am able to answer now, and perhaps more. I do say this: That whenever we inaugurate a cash-and-carry plan we are then doing only the natural thing. We cannot be concerned, if we are sincerely neutral.

Mr. COX rose.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, do not butt in, please, at least in the midst of a sentence. The gentleman used to be a school teacher, and I am sure he understands what I am driving at. Whenever the cash-and-carry plan is being employed, and whenever we are making our own stuff and selling it here to whoever comes and buys, we are only carrying out a natural thing, because then we are saying to whoever may come here that we are not responsible for whoever has the advantage on the high seas today. We do not know who may succeed next month and get the advantage, and we should not concern ourselves with that, if we are sincerely trying to pass a neutral law. We cannot legislate by the measure of conditions in Europe. Besides, we could not possibly, and should not wish to, have anything to do with that; and so if we are going to do a sincerely neutral thing, we should do it in looking after our own affairs. We do not want to drive business into Europe or into Canada that will stay there and injure our business here after peace is restored.

Mr. COX. The gentleman speaks of the cash and carry. Would the gentleman have us abandon the doctrine of freedom of the seas, to which we have always adhered? In other words, must we, in the interest of maintaining a strict neutrality, altogether abandon that doctrine?

Mr. PATRICK. No; that merely means that we could go out there, we have a right to go out there, but we do not wish to go out there and have our heads knocked off.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Referring to the pertinent inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] as to whether or not this contemplated action is for the purpose of increasing business or an effort for peace, does not the gentleman feel that in view of the circumstances now existing under the existing Neutrality Act, from the standpoint of business, it would materially decrease more under the proposed plan than under the existing plan?

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman means that we would have less neutrality?

Mr. HARE. No; I mean that we would have less business under the proposed plan than under the existing plan; and therefore it could not be, and it is not primarily, increased business.

Mr. PATRICK. Of course I think the gentleman is right. It will hurt our merchant marine, but we cannot help it. We are doing this to promote peace.

Mr. COX. I appreciate the gentleman's feelings, and I am sure that I indulge the same feeling toward the belligerents. I have great sympathy for England and France. As an individual I am free to express that, but as a Member of Congress representing the people I have to be very careful in expressing it in the blood of somebody else's boy or in the blood of the young men of this country.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I shall yield to the big chief from Wisconsin in a minute. The reason I am opposed to the present embargo is because, in the last analysis, it is only an innocuous gesture.

It is like putting a fence around the front yard but none around the back yard. It makes a pretense, it seems to me. It is like the baseball manager who took his boy along and pitched him every game that came along. They said to him, "Why on earth do you keep pitching Potsby Botts? He hasn't got a thing on the ball." The manager said, "I know it, but he has such a lovely wind-up." [Laughter.] So that is the way with the embargo.

Mr. COX. I am in accord with the gentleman's views about the law. I think it was a very foolish act for the Congress to have adopted, and I think it ought to be repealed, but I am worried about repealing it now, you understand.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman from Georgia knows it only went into effect the first of May. We had cash and carry for 2 years up until then. Germany came here and bought stuff for those 2 years and before, and laid it in well. Now, would it be unneutral for the United States to say to the nations who do not want to fight, the nations who wanted peace and who did not buy ammunition during that time, when we have lined the larder of the other people, now when the time comes when they want to buy something from us we say, "We will not sell it." Is that not unneutral in itself? Is not that unfair? Would that not be an unwholesome and unbalanced method of doing business?

Mr. COX. I agree that we can take the position that what we are now doing is continuing a question that we initiated when there was no war in Europe as between the present contending parties.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. On the question that is frequently raised, that repeal of the embargo now, after war has started, might be unneutral for the reason that it will hurt Germany, let me suggest that if that be true, then the converse of that proposition is true, that we could not change our law or invoke cash and carry because that would be hurtful to the other countries. In other words, that doctrine means that after war breaks out we are handcuffed, and we cannot change our neutrality law because it might help somebody.

Mr. PATRICK. Exactly.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is our domestic law and we can change it any time we want to.

Mr. PATRICK. That is correct. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. And we should make our own welfare our first concern and legislate without regard.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes. Thank you very kindly. How true that is. How vital that is, not only now, but as a precedent on subsequent legislation, that we attend our own spinning, and that we learn to pass laws for ourselves. If we try to cut our garment to the changing winds of an ever-changing map of Europe, and if we pass laws or withhold laws because of some condition that arises in that peculiarly miasmic place they call Europe, we will always be having the running fits; we will always be with the blind staggers in this Nation. So we cannot afford to attempt that sort of measure. It seems only folly when it is said that because this was the law a few days ago we should not change it. Suppose this is the beginning of a hundred years' war. They had one once. Would we have to be stymied and tied here with our eyes bulging and not even able to do business on a businesslike basis? It is not the American way. It never will be the American way. We can be neutral. We can do what we want to, and yet be ourselves and have an independence that is our own and stand on our own feet and fight our own battles. Who says that we cannot make and sell our own stuff at our own front door, in our own land, our own products to our own buyers? Sell them to whoever may come, from whatever source, as long as they put the money on the barrel head and take it home themselves and do not involve us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman then maintains a position that it is not essential to repeal the existing arms embargo of our Neutrality Act in order to remain neutral or in the interest of peace?

Mr. PATRICK. I think the most peaceful and neutral thing we could do would be to repeal the Embargo Act.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In what respect?

Mr. PATRICK. It is like the Shakespearian character, Honest Iago. It does not hold to the very virtue that it announces itself most highly to proclaim.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer to that question?

Mr. PATRICK. Gladly, to the distinguished Texan.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to the reason why the repeal of the embargo may be helpful to our own basis, the gentleman well knows that the only two times an embargo has been invoked were in the Italo-Ethiopian War and in the Spanish Civil War. Representatives of the State Department testified before our committee on the hearing on this bill that it was exceedingly difficult to enforce that law because the law provided that shipments could not be made to neutral nations for reshipment to belligerent nations, and it was practically impossible to determine when the shipments were to be reshipped.

If that be true of the minor wars, how much more so is it true in the war that is now going on? In the enforcement of any embargo it would be charged that we were unneutral because we might permit it as to some but not as to others, and the injured country would say, "You permit it in the case of the other country but not in our case."

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman. I am in favor of clearing up some of this difficulty. The situation just becomes more involved and complex, so much so that the end is not in sight; we cannot see where the measure stops. You can see the difficult position into which we are getting. Why can we not do the open thing, the sincere thing, the businesslike thing, and yet the intelligent thing, the thing that is more peaceful? It seems such folly for us to attempt to do something that will not stand the test of analysis. That is the only foundation worth standing on. Those who believe in superficial logic will walk up to a Senator or Congressman and say: "Well, Larry, how do you stand on this keeping us out of war?"

"Well," says the Senator or the Congressman, "I am for an embargo against selling high explosives or implements of war to a warring country." And the superficial, light-hearted man goes whistling down the street, without analyzing it, and says: "Well, good old Larry is trying his best to keep us out of war." I honestly believe that is all that has held up the antirepeal forces thus far.

I walked over to the Senate line last Friday afternoon with those going to hear the debate, and talked to more than 20 men. One was from Michigan, two were from Texas—a number of States were represented. I was amazed at their replies. I asked if they knew one another, for I thought there must be an agreement among them. They were strangers to each other. Out of the whole 23 or 24 I found only 4 men who were not wholeheartedly in favor of repeal of the embargo and enactment of the cash-and-carry plan.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If Hitler's government, if Moscow and Japan brought money here and laid it on the barrel head, would the gentleman be in favor of selling them arms, munitions, implements of war, and war supplies to carry away?

Mr. PATRICK. The word "everybody" means just what it says.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman would be willing to sell to them, would he?

Mr. PATRICK. Is the gentleman serious in his question?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes; I am very serious. If Moscow, Germany, and Japan want to purchase arms, munitions, or implements of war, and war supplies and came here and laid cash on the barrel head, would the gentleman sell to these countries.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is using "Moscow" figuratively, meaning the Soviet Union?



Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Yes; I mean the Soviet Union, which is now engaged in war.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I have not gotten the gentleman's full question yet.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Under the gentleman's proposal of selling arms, munitions of war, war supplies, and implements of war with the only restriction that cash must be laid on the barrel head, would the gentleman be in favor of selling them to the Soviet Union, Germany, and Japan?

Mr. PATRICK. Certainly; if they wanted to buy and carry them away.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. They would have to carry them away themselves.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; certainly. Neutrality is neutrality.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I must yield first to the gentleman from Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not a fact that the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin answered itself?

Mr. PATRICK. I think so.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman from Alabama or any other Member of Congress would not have the right to say which nation would be hurt. When the law is passed it will speak for itself and will be equally enforced as between the several nations. The thing we are trying to get away from now is an effort to discriminate as between various nations. Certainly if the law is repealed it will be lawful to sell to any and all nations. The nations named by the gentleman can buy on the same terms and under the same conditions as any other nation. Is not that true?

Mr. PATRICK. To be sure, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is making a splendid address. I think it is very enlightening. In connection with statements that have been made, is it not a fact that during the last 4 or 5 years the German Government and other warring powers have bought from us great quantities of steel and iron, the very things they need in war, and are now using it against the democracies and against civilization? For the last 4 years this iron and steel has been taken right out of New York Harbor to Germany to be used in this war for which they were then preparing.

Mr. PATRICK. We knew it, for did we not see the war clouds rising all the time?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. PATRICK. And now since we sold to them all the while and knowing they were preparing for war—and also to Japan—are we now to deny the same materials to the nations which tried to be peaceful?

We cannot now shut our gates in the faces of friends, but to keep them open to our friends we must keep them open to all, and that is exactly the position we want to take. Not to do so would be to do an unneutral act and at the same time would be doing exactly what was done when Jefferson was President of the United States; that is, throttling our own industry and putting an "Oh, grab me" sign on America and its business.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. Will not the gentleman admit that in the last 4 years or the last 7 years we have sold more munitions, more steel, and more scrap iron to the so-called Allies than we have to the Hitler-Russian Government?

Mr. PATRICK. What difference does that make? We are neutral, are we not?

Mr. MILLER. Then answer this question: Is it any more neutral to sell to all nations than it is to refuse to sell to any nation?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind. Some nations are at war, while some are not.

Mr. MILLER. I meant to nations at war.

Mr. PATRICK. No.

Mr. MILLER. Why not leave the act as it is? It is neutral.

Mr. PATRICK. Because we are thinking for ourselves. I answered that, if the gentleman will observe. We have sold all these years to the aggressor nations that have already feathered their nests. Now come the nations who hoped for peace and did not feather their nests—and what are we going to do? Are we to supply the belligerent nations and deny supplies to the nations that are naturally peaceful?

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman honestly believe that the so-called Allies have been just as busily arming during all these years as the so-called aggressor nations?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not believe that; no.

Mr. MILLER. They have told us they could not pay their war debts on that account.

Mr. PATRICK. But we have their money over here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Can the gentleman tell me if he has heard any explanation given by those who oppose repeal of the arms embargo with reference to what reason there should be for not treating arms, ammunition, and implements of war like we do other commodities that are branded as contraband; if they are all subject to search and seizure, why not treat them all alike?

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to have some gentleman who wishes to support the embargo spend about 20 minutes on that subject. I am sure it would take at least 20 minutes for him to develop it.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Further commenting on the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, is it not true that we would appear at least to be more unneutral, and I think would be less neutral, if we would undertake to retain embargo in that it will certainly put this country in a class by itself with reference to other major world powers and any time we adopt a policy that is contrary to the policy adopted by other major world powers do we not immediately become a target at which the several different nations in the world will shoot? And might that not within itself probably involve us in difficulties?

Mr. PATRICK. I think so. However, I am not well enough acquainted with the embargo acts of other nations to discuss them as one well versed upon that subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of any previous orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert certain extracts from a report on the American German youth movement in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes in addition to the 5 already allotted me. In other words, I would like to speak for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to make certain observations with reference to matters having to do with the interests of America, and what I may say is not

to be treated as a criticism of a certain investigation of un-American activities. In these times we should not criticize, but should try to constructively advise, even a committee of Congress, regarding certain things that should be done and should not be done. In this spirit I stand here today to say that there have been certain matters appearing in the headlines of the press which I think go beyond the jurisdiction of the resolution providing for the committee to investigate un-American activities.

May I call attention to the fact that the committee allowed a witness to testify with respect to what happened in Russia 10 or 15 years ago. This witness was a man by the name of Krivitsky, who, in my own opinion, is nothing but a "phony." He is an alien in this country. He is here to sell his wares. He prepared these articles for certain publishers; if the facts are not correct, the articles are libelous under our laws. In order to protect the publishers involved as well as himself, Krivitsky gave testimony before a congressional committee, which would give the articles immunity under the Constitution.

There was another witness—a criminal who admits he served in prison—who took the stand. He claims to have been a Communist; and I want to state most emphatically at this point that I have no use for communism or any other foreign "ism," nor would I attempt to protest any lawful exposure of their subversive activities. On the contrary, I would be glad to help. This man stated that the Communist Party 13 years ago borrowed \$1,700,000 from a man by the name of Rothstein, a gambler, to fight labor troubles in New York City. The committee allowed that witness to besmirch the police department of my city, the police commissioner, and indirectly the mayor, because this ex-convict stated the \$1,700,000 was borrowed from this gambler to buy police protection and to finance the strike. It is highly questionable, and no proof thereof was obtained by the committee that a gambler of Mr. Rothstein's reputation should lend any money to anyone except members of his own gang or clique. But, assuming that to be true, what evidence was there presented of the bribe to police of the city of New York? Why should civil servants be exposed to serious charges of bribery without definite evidence to prove their guilt?

Mr. Speaker, the police department of the city of New York is composed of almost 24,000 men, who are the finest type of police officers and the finest type of Americans you have ever come in contact with; and that goes for a fine mayor and a fine police commissioner. It is unfair, and the committee should not have allowed such evidence to go into the record, unless it had actual proof of this corruption. This matter was investigated 13 years ago by the city of New York, and no corruption was found, and there was no proof that any money was loaned by Rothstein or anybody else. This testimony besmirched the police department of the city of New York, and there is no way for the city of New York or the 24,000 police officers, who are trying to do their duty, to defend themselves from accusations before a congressional committee.

What is important to me, Mr. Speaker, is to protect our own United States. Why does not the Dies committee or some other committee give us some real facts—not about what happened in Russia 13 years ago, or whether 400,000 or 500,000 persons were purged, as Krivitsky said? We are not a bit concerned about that. We are concerned with our democratic principles here in the United States.

What is going on today? What are the Communists doing today that in any way affects our people and our form of government? What are the Nazis doing today, and what are all "isms" doing today, and what can we do to eradicate these evils?

Let me repeat that I have the greatest fondness for the members of this committee and its chairman. As I said in my opening remarks, I have no criticism to make against them. I think they are trying honestly to do a good job, and they have given us much light on subversive activities. I am making this observation for the purpose of helping the committee. Why do they not go into the question of alien youth movements in this country? There are at least 50,000 chil-

dren between the ages of 4 and 14 who are members of an organization under the leadership of Fritz Kuhn—an organization which implants in their hearts the idea that the Nazi government of Hitler is the best government for them, and that they must follow the teachings and the principles of this so-called government.

If the investigators of the committee were investigating this youth movement, they would find a communication by Fritz Kuhn, which I shall place in the Record, in which he addresses this youth movement. As I said a moment ago, there are at least 50,000 children in this organization, and some of them refuse to salute our flag. In their hearts is imbedded the spirit of "Heil Hitler" and of war. If the committee would take the trouble to investigate, they would find that some time in June 1939 Mr. Kuhn, who claims he is the leader not only of the German Bund in this country but also of the American-German Youth Movement, addressed a communication to the members of that movement. I have a copy of it here and you will read it in the Record. In this communication he tells them to carry on in the same philosophy and under the same principles as the Nazi government, and to do what Mr. Hitler tells them to do. I shall also place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks information about certain activities of the girls' youth movement. There are at least 25,000 girls in this country who are having instilled in them the spirit of hate and intolerance by the so-called Nazi Bund under the leadership of Mr. Fritz Kuhn. These are the problems we should investigate and these are the conditions we want to eradicate in this country. These are the facts the Congress and the people of this country would like to know. We are not concerned with anything else but America. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the documents to which I referred a moment ago are as follows:

[From Ten Years German Youth in U. S. A.]

(Editorial)

DEDICATED TO OUR YOUTH AT THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN GERMAN YOUTH MOVEMENT

In the comparatively short period, 10 years, a proud and zealous movement has been built up, thanks to the cooperation of the fore-runners of the German Youth in America and its friends and patrons. All those who prophesied defeat not believing on the preservation of our folkdom to last for times thereafter were greatly mistaken. Numerous Youth camps have been made possible without greater funds. German schools have been erected by dozens of cities, where the adherents of old times had long ago given up the fight for preservation of our folkdom.

All these accomplishments mean, of course, only a start, a small beginning, but the hitting success within such a short time does prove that the spirit which has been planted by Adolf Hitler into the heart and mind of the German people in the homeland, will be well able to bring about a unit of world opinion and a renewing of the will to live of the American Germandom.

The entire, great, healthy kernel of this German-American can be easily comprehended. This beginning will be for you, you boys and girls of German origin in America. Some day you will take over the work to continue the construction.

To your day of honor 1939. Sieg-heil. Free America.

Fritz Kuhn, Bund Leader.

[From Ten Years German Youth in U. S. A.]

FIVE YEARS OF GIRLS' DIVISIONS IN UNITED STATES

It was 4 years on January 12 when the first call for a girls' division was sounded. Erna Dinkelacker and Tilde Richter called the girls to a meeting. The new movement grew fast.

Erna Dinkelacker took over the general leadership of the girls and Erika Wagebusch became group leader.

In June 1934 they had 33 girl members present. Today the membership goes into hundreds of hundreds.

"German girl, you belong to us." This call sounds all over the country. As much as the boy belongs to an organization so does the girl. The girls here in this land are exposed to extreme superficiality. When you see these young dolls on the street smeared with powder and paint, you can't distinguish a girl of 15 or 16 years of age from one at the end of her twenties. There is nothing young about them. They look all tired out with movie manners making them disgusting to look at. A man who thinks can't visualize such a doll becoming sometime a real comrade for life and a mother of a coming generation. The influence of a folk corrupting race has already done "good work" in this country. And the American woman has already entered into this whirl of decay inasmuch as some warnings are sounded now and again, but these voices are too weak.

But the voice of the youth division has saved many girls. We often saw them come to us with painted fingernails and lips but after some home meetings the warlike paint was vanished.



But not only the painting vanished. There is a difference in the stride of our girls which is now sound and firm. They now come back from camps and sport places with a natural color. They don't need any more paint.

We want girls who know their task, which is to be the guardian of the old German inheritance, who are to keep German customs, German manners, and before all to faithfully keep their German blood pure.

For all that we march and are proud to know that we are helping to build up Germanism in America.

We know that nothing can hold us back. Through night and fog, carrying the black flag with the white sign of victory shining on it we march proudly and silently into the fifth year of battle, marching on toward our goal.

JANUARY 1933.

#### [From Ten Years German Youth in United States]

##### GERMAN YOUTH IN NORTH AMERICA 10 YEARS

Today is the anniversary of the day on which the foundation was laid to a youth movement by a small group of German boys. Something which seemingly appeared still impossible on March 1929 was just the thing we longed for with all our hearts, namely, the unifying of the entire youth of German origin in North America. It has been of unspeakable effort to accomplish a planned structure which at the same time had to be based on a healthy foundation. On the one hand, we lacked the means by which to accomplish anything. On the other hand, we were boys at the age of about 12 to 24, who had to create everything from within themselves, and sometimes got a headache from planning how to go about things. The manifold opposition also was not just the thing to further our growth, but perhaps at the same time was to spur us and to give us the tenacity for reaching, step by step, our great zeal.

While black, red, and gold still were the colors of Germany, the German Youth in United States bore the colors of an awakening Germanism.

#### [From Youth Movement Develops]

##### YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

The first motion of the national force of American Germanism fell in the year 1933, and found its first expression in the new-founded bund of Friends of the New Germany. We saw in it a new mutual zeal in fighting for a unit of the entire German nationality. With this the German boys' division as a youth movement became a youth organization brought upon a broader foundation with the unification of the bund. From the boys' division until now, comprising only Greater New York, grew the youth division, which soon was to extend all over the country. Youth divisions were founded in all cities in which the bund already had local groups. Boys and girls from 8 to 18 years of age were admitted to them. This was, of course, only made possible with the help of the bund, which brought about a tremendous development of these youth divisions. While before 1933 the boys' divisions comprised more or less a selection of boys destined to become later the leaders of the youth, the youth division, therefore, could use these boys after 1933 as leaders, operating the then blooming youth division on a broader foundation.

##### FROM COAST TO COAST

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four was the year of development. The idea of the boys' division was brought about all over the land. In far-off cities the flag of the youth would fly. Until now groups of German boys' divisions existed only in greater New York—Manhattan and Brooklyn. The task now was to build up the boys' division in other cities too. On the first "day of youth" in April the order to attack was given. Soon after a beer truck, packed with 40 boys in uniform, instead of beer boxes, went off in the direction to Buffalo. There, in the city of Niagara Falls, Eberhard von Nasse was living, the founder and protector of the boys' division. With his help a third division could be formed.

Forty boys in a beer truck traveled 675 kilometers to Buffalo. The truck broke down several times. At last we had to send it away and we continued on foot to Buffalo. At last, after 24 hours, we reached Buffalo. A score of people were waiting for us. A hot supper for refreshment, and then into the quarters. The next evening our youth festivity took place, resulting in 20 new memberships for the boys' division. So division 3, Buffalo, was formed.

Soon after some boys of New Jersey contended to create the fourth division. A couple of boys entered into it and division 4 was founded.

On July 1934, an advancement was made to the oldest city of the American Germanism, Pennsylvania. The division 5, Philadelphia, was founded. A couple of boys of the boys' division of Brooklyn went to Philadelphia, explaining to the local group of the bund the necessity of a boys' division, found a home for it, appointed a youth leader, and went away again, leaving behind a division of 15 men. So division 5, Philadelphia, was founded.

Within a short time, in nearby Newark, N. J., a boys' division was founded. Nassau County, Long Island, followed as division 7, built up also by the nearby Brooklyn.

Even in the Middle West, the spirit of an awakening youth of German origin was being exercised. Division, Detroit, Mich., was

created, and soon after a division in Chicago, the great city of the Middle West.

So, at the end of 1934, 10 boys' divisions were founded from coast to coast, being one in will and faith, who are to lead the way for a great American-German future.

Besides those successful boys' divisions stands, already, the beginning of the girls' divisions. In the midst of a feverish soliciting of the boys, the girls' division came to life, and for the German girl in the United States an organization was created.

##### BOYS' DIVISION, SECTION 3—BUFFALO

Some days ago we received your first newspaper. General astonishment, especially about the closing article.

"Section 3 in Buffalo shall show what they accomplished up to the present time. What are we able to do? Well, we are not far-sighted here (perhaps you in New York are). Therefore, we couldn't report our activities until now. But it has made a tremendous impression upon us that our guardian (?) has already published a newspaper. Big Eberhard, as the mother of our company, however, told us already about the necessity of having some day our own newspaper. But, that this plan should come true so soon, that we hadn't expected of you New Yorkers.

But, you want to know of us, what we are doing here. Of course, we still are very young. Just 3 weeks ago we had you with us here, and you inspired the desire in us to work in Buffalo also, in the spirit of the boys' division. But we have accomplished already a great deal. On our last journey we have been represented by 14 men. To get 14 German boys together within 3 weeks—that means something. It proves how strong and lasting the reaction of your visit with us in Buffalo has been. To this very day we always speak of you, and wish that we already could be like you. We already dream of the summer camp where we can be with you, where we can play with you, where you can show us the genuine spirit of the boys' divisions. We look forward to the day when we will see you again. You have awakened in us a great longing by your proud German spirit, while you were with us in Buffalo. We hope to see you again soon—that is the wish of all of us.

Division 3 marches—you can be sure of that. Last Sunday we went hunting, then some games, hand ball, and so forth. Then, for the first time in this year, bathing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

##### PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE ARGENTINE

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman preceding me this afternoon in regard to the problem of neutrality and also with regard to the subversive influences we must combat. Earlier in the day the gentleman from New York spoke of a still greater problem, as he thought, or one equal to these, confronting us, when he called attention to some of the trade agreements now being contemplated, and I should like to say just a few words about prospective trade agreements.

I also went yesterday to present my statement to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine. I find myself in somewhat of a predicament in this respect, that in general I favor trade agreements where they can be mutually profitable and beneficial, but they must be reciprocally helpful to obtain my approval. I feel that if we enter into trade agreements with industrial or semi-industrial countries, there is a chance of our reaching agreements which may be mutually helpful, since we are semi-industrial ourselves. I do not hesitate a moment to condemn a trade agreement or a proposal for such an agreement if it seems that it is bound to be harmful to any considerable portion of our people.

I wish to say in all fairness to the present study that we should remember that the committee now is really studying the various items of this proposed agreement, and we should not act on the assumption that the proposals have already been incorporated into an agreement. I hope that most of the items studied will not be included. I also wish to say, as I did yesterday to the committee, that these men have my great sympathy in their huge task on such a complicated measure. I expressed to them a profound and sincere hope that their judgment will equal their patriotic intent in their study. That is my feeling in the matter.

The reason I am particularly alarmed about this proposed trade agreement with the Argentine is that we now are contemplating making such an agreement with a great agricultural empire, we ourselves also being a great agricultural

people. The Argentine lies about as far south of the Equator as we are to the north, and, except with reverse seasons, that area has about the same climatic conditions and the same agricultural production. The agricultural products of the two countries are highly competitive.

I fear that too many of our leading experts are apt to overlook the fact that a large part of our country west of the one hundredth meridian is semiarid, and nine-tenths of it is fit agriculturally only for grazing; also that livestock, cattle, sheep, and wool production is the basic production of that area out in the far West. This is exactly what the Argentine produces, and that is what my people fear. Western cattlemen and sheepmen are struggling with their backs to a wall. Our Government has placed many restrictions lately around our western livestock industry. If we should be so unwise as to throw against them the competition of the Argentine, which God forbid, the livestock industry will vanish from our West.

Cattle and sheep have been the basis of the early economic life of Arizona, not considering now the rich mineral deposits. So what I would like this committee engaged in the study to suggest—and I shall back the policy so long as this is carried out—that we seek out those nations which produce different products from our own and which we need, with a view of so arranging lessened duties that there may be profitable trade between us. I love my neighbors, but there is a limit to the love I bear my neighbors. I am not willing to cripple any American industries, certainly not the basic industries of my State, in order to encourage trade.

I know, of course, that the committee is looking at the good of the whole country, but it cannot be for the good of the whole country to cripple the livestock industry or the mining industry or the agricultural industry of half of our people. Just as an example, in the irrigated valleys of the southern part of my State we have been growing cotton. There is a surplus of cotton. We have been trying to get away from it. Down in Yuma County, where it costs about \$120 or \$130 per acre to bring the desert into cultivation through the reclamation process, we have now turned thousands of acres to the production of flaxseed. Down there we can produce 25 bushels per acre at a cost of about \$1.08 per bushel. This compares with certain other parts of our country where 6 bushels of flaxseed are produced per acre. It was at the invitation of the Department of Agriculture that the farmers down in Yuma County, Ariz., turned their acres not to cotton, not to wheat, but to flax or alfalfa. Incidentally, I may say that one-tenth of all the alfalfa seed of this country is grown on the few tillable acres in Yuma County, Ariz., and there are not enough acres down there tilled to equal one big wheat ranch in Montana. If we should lower the duty on flaxseed or on alfalfa seed from Argentina, we would ruin these farmers and jeopardize Uncle Sam's investment in those valuable lands.

Mr. Speaker, we started in the beginning of this Republic as practically a 100-percent-agricultural people. Gradually we have become urbanized and industrialized. I do not want this Nation to be completely urbanized or industrialized. I believe that a composite mixture of economic elements give us strength. I want a variegated industry and I do not feel that we would be doing the economics of this country justice by destroying our farmer class, our stock raisers, in order to build up our industries, even though they should be built up. So in order that we may continue to be half industrial and half rural, as we have been, I prefer that the farm and the factory in this country be mutually dependent on each other, and this is a policy which I think is a wise national policy. I never want to see the day when the cities of America are dependent upon the pampas of the Argentine.

Right now, of course, we would like to cultivate a good-neighbor policy with Latin America to the south of us—yes; more particularly that part of Latin America lying near the Equator which produces, as Central America does and as Brazil does, products which we need. Yes; we have no bananas! I think I could grow them in my own back yard in

Tempe, Ariz., but I do not want to do so. I prefer that we get them from Central America. We grow no coffee. We grow no rubber, at least not from trees, although we can produce that in some parts of the Southwest. Truly we can produce rubber in Arizona, but it is not an established, pioneer industry, which we would kill by getting rubber somewhere else.

So I wish that in our reciprocal-trade agreements we could see to it that we trade that which we have for that which we want from other countries and cannot produce here.

Now, in regard to the Argentine, there is one thing that particularly strikes me very unfavorably, and that is that a great deal of American capital has gone into the Argentine. American packing concerns have gone down there and they have exported American capital to build their plants. They used cheap foreign labor, depriving our own people of those jobs, and now they want greater freedom to ship their finished products into this country. I have no sympathy with that sort of trade agreements.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Arizona be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I do not know that I care for 10 minutes, unless there are questions to be asked.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. What proportion of canned beef comes in from the Argentine that is used in this country today? What is the total consumption?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am unable to answer that; I have not the figures. I understand, however, that canned Argentine beef is quite frequently found on the shelves of our storehouses.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that there is not enough imported here to take care of the requirement of the Marine Corps for 1 day?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. If that is true, I am glad to know it. I am unaware of the exact situation. I might say to my friend from Kansas that it is not alone the amount that is shipped in but it is the threat that forces down the price of our meat. It is true, perhaps, that we would not include fresh meat, and certainly no live animals, from the Argentine, because we fear the foot-and-mouth disease. However, if we admit the byproducts, we might do something that will in turn reflect itself in the price of meat, because it is not the meat of the animal which tells the whole story. I am reliably informed that a packing house will pay more for a live animal than it gets for the meat which that animal produces, making its profit out of the byproducts; so that if we admit the byproducts from Argentine, we might as well admit the fresh meat or the live animal, because the effect would be the same.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a good deal like the woman who reached into her husband's pocket and got out his pay envelope. He got sore about it, and his wife said, "What are you sore about? There is nothing in it." The husband said, "No; but it is the principle of the thing." Is not that about all there is to this?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. I was looking at some figures which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HORTON] had, and which showed that there were two and a half million pounds imported from Argentina into this country in June of this year, and three and a half million pounds in August of this year, and those figures do not include imports from Brazil and other South American countries, which are considerable.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. In conclusion I want to affirm my belief that trade between nations is a means of peace, and that such is one way to promote peace, but if we permit our capital to go into other countries to exploit their labor in order to make profits, that is not a means of good will, but a



very potent means of ill will. That is one thing that I wish we might take steps to prevent to the extent it is now going on. [Applause.]

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7588) granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated October 10, 1939, with reference to national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5802. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the American Communications Association, Marine Local No. 6, T. J. Van Ermen, secretary, of Seattle, Wash., urging that Congress keep America out of war; maintain the Bill of Rights to protect labor's civil liberties against any and all emergency measures; and urging that belligerent resistance be made to all efforts to curtail, eviscerate, or destroy labor legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5803. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition containing answers to questions submitted to Bakery Drivers Local 276, American Federation of Labor, Los Angeles, Calif., by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend William S. Abernethy, D. D., minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. And because Thou art God, maker and upholder of the universe, the same yesterday, today, and forever, the Changeless One, we turn to Thee at this moment. When we feel our insufficiency, grant us wisdom. When we lose our way, be Thou our guide. When we are weak, make us strong.

In this hour of crisis, give to those who bear great responsibilities of state wisdom equal to the need. May the eyes of this Nation ever be turned Godward, we beseech Thee. Thou art our hope and our salvation. May we in this favored land not disappoint Thee. In the name of Christ, our Lord, we offer this prayer. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day

Tuesday, October 17, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### INVITATION TO ATTEND CONFERENCES ON INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, October 16, 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The series of conferences on inter-American cultural relations arranged by this Department has awakened such widespread interest in all parts of the country that I take pleasure in calling these gatherings to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The purpose of the conference is to enlist the cooperation of the leading private agencies in the United States toward the development of deeper and sounder understanding with the other American republics. I should like to invite all Members of the Senate to attend such of the sessions as may interest them.

The conferences are as follows:

October 18 and 19: Conference on inter-American relations in the field of music, to be held in the Whittall Pavilion, Library of Congress. A program is enclosed.

November 9 and 10: Conference on education and inter-American cultural relations, to be held at the Mayflower Hotel. The program will soon be announced.

November 29 and 30: Conference on books, libraries, and translations. The program is now in preparation.

The Department is gratified at the attention which these conferences have received, and believes they may make an important contribution to the advancement of peace and friendship among the American nations.

I am, my dear Mr. Vice President,  
Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

#### PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, endorsing and approving the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association for the establishment of a memorial garden at Andersonville, Ga., the placing of bronze markers explanatory of the history of Andersonville (site of a Civil War Confederate military prison), and the erection of an heroic monument in stone, dedicated to peace and union—all "to be commensurate with the virtue of the dead who lie buried there and with the im-